

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the office action dated January 16, 2009, and completion of the personal interview of March 11, 2009. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and summarized herein. The Examiner's consideration of Applicant's arguments filed on December 18, 2008, is noted with appreciation. Claims 1-3, 7-12, and 16-18 are currently pending.

Claims 8, 17, and 18 have been amended to correct certain informalities. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 7-12, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,348,971 to Owa et al. (*hereinafter*, "Owa") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0052995 to Idehara (*hereinafter*, "Idehara") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611 to Sesek (*hereinafter*, "Sesek"). In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The subject application is directed to a system and method for optimized routing of printing. A print job is commenced to a print port associated with a client machine and print job data is queued. A prompt is issued to an associated user for print optimization authority and the print job data is communicated to the print port so as to generate a printout therefrom. Status data is received from each of the plurality of associated printer devices, which status data includes data representative of a resource commitment level of each associated printer device relative to prior print job requests associated therewith. A print optimization instruction is received from the associated user in response to an issued prompt so as to commence selection of an alternative associated print device for printing as well as delay criteria data corresponding to an acceptable delay period associated with commencement of the print job. The user preauthorizes redirection of the print job to an alternative device in the event specified conditions are met. Elapsed time is determined relative to commencement of the print job relative to each of the plurality of printer devices. The status data is tested data against selected test criteria, elapsed time, and received delay criteria data to determine whether at least one alternative associated printer device is desired for printing. The user is then prompted with information as to the available, alternative printers, along with information as to when a job can be expected to

commence from such alternative devices. The user is able to select an alternative printer, passed on the delay period and convenience of the printing device. The print job data is selectively redirected, in accordance with the preauthorization and user selection data, from a primary designated associated printer device by assigning the print port to a device port of a secondary associated printer device of the plurality thereof in accordance with a print optimization instruction and an output of the testing, wherein the output of the testing is indicative that the primary designated associated printer device exceeds the user-specified delay criteria.

As discussed during the Interview, Owa is directed to system wherein a printer is available at specific operation times. Idehara is directed to a system where it takes too much time to complete a job. Amendment to each of independent claims 1 and 10 clarifies that a user selects a delay criteria that will trigger a search for alternative printing devices. Once this delay threshold is achieved, the user is then prompted with one or more alternative devices, along with the anticipated time for job commencement on each. The user then decides whether an alternative is desirable, and redirection of the job is made based on the user's determination. Thus, in the amended claims, a user is intimately involved in the decision as to whether, in specified circumstances, an alternative is worth reviewing. If those criteria are met, then the user is given sufficient information relative to one or more alternative printing devices to allow the user to make a subjective decision on redirection. The user therefore maintains control over redirection. The user's decision suitably includes knowledge of the delay which they can integrate with knowledge of factors such as the relative convenience of the alternative devices relative to their associated delay.

In accordance with the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art, and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/675,689
Amendment dated March 17, 2009
Response to Final Office action dated January 16, 2009

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/00020.

Date: 3/17/09

Respectfully submitted,



Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009